



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

series, and as there is practically no possibility that a north-pole type should be identical with a south-pole type, there must exist at least two great lines of descent for both the animal and the vegetable world. As to the former, if we assume that the vertebrate type coming down from the Vermes through Amphioxus, was a north-pole type, why may not the molluscan or the crustacean type be a south-pole type? As regards plants the case is more obscure, but it is at least a fair hypothesis that the remarkable "*Glossopteris flora*" of the southern hemisphere that flourished in late Paleozoic and early Mesozoic time, may have originated at the south pole.

As regards the polar, or at least northern origin of the human race, the readers of the *Anthropologist* do not need to have their attention called to the articles of the Marquis Saprota, based chiefly on the facts brought forward by De Mortillet, which appeared in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* in 1883, nor to the address of Prof. Edward S. Morse before the Section of Anthropology of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1884. But Mr Scribner has not ignored the human aspect of the question, though this, like the rest of the book, is purely theoretical, and no facts whatever are adduced. This is not a criticism of the book. In fact it is one of the beauties of it. The book is not large enough to record the facts, and its style and character would have been changed, I had almost said spoiled, by their introduction. Any one who reads the book can see that the author's head was full of facts, and that all he was trying to do was to reason from a store of facts to certain large conclusions. Those who speak disrespectfully of this method are often unable to make any use of their facts, however many they may possess. I do not hesitate to say that, if approached in the proper spirit, pages 51 to 53 of this book may be read with profit by all anthropologists.

LESTER F. WARD.

A Guide to the Antiquities of the Bronze Age. By CHARLES H. READ. British Museum. Printed by order of the Trustees. London: 1904. 8°, 160 pp., 148 figs.

This is a sequel to the volume published in 1902, under the title *Stone Age Guide*. The present book is devoted to remains in England, but it illustrates also the connections with the Continent. Again, the Bronze Age stands between the Iron Age on the hither side and the Stone Age on the far side. Well does the author say that metallurgy was the most important step in human progress between the invention of fire-making and the development of steam and electricity. The arguments

for a Copper Age preceding the Bronze are carefully examined and found wanting. Quite as futile are attempts to find a very ancient Iron Age as compared with Bronze. In this connection Dr Walter Hough makes the suggestion that in his explorations in Arizona he found that the confined heat in the potters' kilns has been sufficient to fuse and distort the clay and produce vitreous slag. The heating of pit ovens for roasting roots was another device for intensifying heat, and pit furnaces were well known to ancient bronze-workers. However the combination of copper and tin may have been brought about, it was not a sudden discovery. Mr Read follows this earliest metallurgy throughout Britain, France, Germany, Switzerland, Austria-Hungary, Denmark, the Russian Empire, Italy, Spain, Egypt and the eastern Mediterranean, Mesopotamia, Persia, and China, as illustrated in the marvelous collections of the British Museum, in myriad forms of tools and weapons, vessels and utensils, jewelry and insignia, trappings and vehicles. In the introductory chapter, after reviewing the first appearance of metals in human industry, Mr Read takes up the ethnology of ancient peoples inhabiting those parts of the world with which the British Isles and the adjacent countries are most intimately connected. After reviewing the Aryan question and deciding upon Ripley's Alpine race as the one that forced the Aryan language upon the aboriginal inhabitants of Europe, the author examines the graves and their contents for evidence, with the following conclusions: Bronze was introduced into the southern counties of England from the continent; in the mounds only the simplest tools and weapons occur; the Phœnicians probably obtained tin from Cornwall 1500-1200 B. C.; 1800 B. C. is a probable date for the beginning of bronze in Great Britain and Ireland. At the close of the introduction Mr Read presents an interesting example of bringing historical chronology and early culture history together in the establishment of probable dates. The bulk of the volume is devoted to the description and illustration of specimens in the cases.

O. T. MASON.

Comparative Philology. A Comparison between Semitic and American Languages with a Map and Illustrations. By ARNOLD M. LEESEBERG, *Dr. Juris*. Leyden, 1903. Late E. J. Brill. 8°, pp. i-viii, 1-83.

In these days of exact philological science, it is difficult to understand how such a work as this was permitted to see the light. The title alone would be sufficient to make competent philologists look askance, but when the contents are carefully examined, the reader is lost in won-